

Ohio - 10th District

10 Clarence E. Miller (R)

Of Lancaster — Elected 1966

Born: Nov. 1, 1917, Lancaster, Ohio.
Education: Attended Lancaster H.S.
Occupation: Electrical engineer.
Family: Wife, Helen Brown; two children.
Religion: Methodist.
Political Career: Lancaster City Council, 1957-63; mayor of Lancaster, 1963-65.
Capitol Office: 2208 Rayburn Bldg. 20515; 225-5131.



In Washington: Miller has made a career out of one simple amendment — the one that has led his colleagues to nickname him “5-percent Clarence.” Year after year, on bill after bill, he has taken the floor to propose that appropriations be reduced by 5 percent across-the-board, or, if that seems politically impossible, 2 percent, or 5 percent with a few exemptions.

By 1982 Miller was ranking Republican on an Appropriations subcommittee that handled funding for the Treasury Department and Postal Service. Most GOP members in that position normally work closely with the Democratic subcommittee chairmen, presenting a united front on their appropriations bill.

Miller was his old self, however, asking the House to amend the fiscal 1983 Treasury-Postal Service bill to cut 2 percent across-the-board from “non-mandatory” spending. The subcommittee chairman, Democrat Edward R. Roybal of California, complained that Miller’s amendment “would have a very detrimental effect on the overall basic operations of this government.” But the House adopted it.

Miller picked up his budget-cutting habit initially from Frank T. Bow, the Ohio Republican who was senior GOP member on Appropriations when Miller arrived in 1967. In his first year in Congress, Miller was already standing up to endorse a 5 percent cut proposed by Bow on the expenditures for Congress itself. “If we must begin cutting our own salaries to show our sincerity,” Miller said, “then let us do it.”

But it took Miller several years after Bow’s retirement in 1972 to claim the amendment as his personal property. It was not until 1976 that he first offered it, to an Agriculture bill, and it was badly beaten. He offered it to 10 separate bills that year, and never got it passed. Even when he tried it on an unpopular foreign aid appropriation, holding up a sign to ridicule the common argument that “there are 100 other

programs that could be cut, but don’t cut this one,” he could not get most members to take him seriously.

The next year, however, with fiscal conservatism spreading through the House, the situation began to change. Miller won his first victory in 1977, persuading the House on a 214-168 vote to cut foreign aid money by 5 percent.

In 1978, the year Proposition 13 passed in California, Miller discovered his weapon’s potential — but also its limits. Modifying his strategy, he offered an amendment to cut labor, education and welfare spending by a smaller 2 percent, and found that it passed easily.

But on foreign aid, he went for too big a slice — 8 percent — and lost by 15 votes. Then his 2 percent cut in agriculture spending, which seemed to have a majority on a roll-call vote, was beaten back with some serious lobbying by the House leadership.

In retrospect, 1978 may have been the peak year for what Miller’s critics like to call his “meat ax” approach to spending. In 1979 his 5 percent foreign aid cut was superseded by a 2 percent reduction proposed by one of the bill’s managers; his HEW cut was not passed at all. Since then, despite the budget-cutting emphasis of the Reagan administration, the only Miller amendments that have passed are in the 2 percent range.

Beyond the idea of across-the-board cuts, Miller has not been one of the more active legislators. Occasionally, however, he does find conspicuous outlets for his politics of thrift. In 1981 he tried and failed to persuade the Appropriations Committee to rescind a \$10,000 increase in the average yearly expense allowance for House members. The same year, he fought successfully to preserve \$13 million in the Treasury Department budget that was used to persuade Americans to buy U.S. savings bonds.

Critics said the bonds could not be pro-

Clarence E. Miller, R-Ohio

Ohio 10

Nearly as large as Connecticut, the 10th is a part of Appalachia grafted onto a Midwestern state. During the 1960s, it was stagnating economically and losing population. In the 1970s, however, people began moving back to the area, in part because of the increased interest in coal mining. With a 14 percent population increase, the 10th was second in growth among Ohio districts during the decade.

Redistricting changed the economic character of what had been the poorest district in the state. Some of the most poverty-stricken counties — Hocking, Jackson and Vinton — were removed from the 10th and about 60,000 new residents in the more prosperous eastern half of Licking County (Newark) were added.

While redistricting enlarged the industrial blue-collar base, however, the 10th has not lost its traditional Republican character. It was the only district in the state that failed to elect a Democrat to the House during the New Deal years.

Athens County, the home of Ohio University, is the only predictably Democratic part of the district. It was one of just two Ohio counties to support George McGovern for president in 1972. Many of the poorer voters in other counties along the Ohio River still call themselves Democrats — a remnant of Civil War days — but their

moted truthfully as a wise investment. Miller insisted that they were. "It is an easy way to save," he said. "Not only that, the rate is higher than what they would receive at a commercial bank with a passbook." Miller's side eventually prevailed.

The Ohio Republican also has taken an interest in foreign aid policy over the years, especially in the idea of making Third World nations supply the United States with strategic materials as a condition of financial assistance. "It is important to receive something for the foreign assistance we are giving away," he once said. But he has not been successful in promoting this effort.

A more conspicuous achievement is Miller's attendance record, one of the best in the House. During most years he never misses a vote; he once introduced a resolution providing that members would lose their voting privileges

Southeast — Lancaster; Zanesville

conservative outlook leads them toward Republican candidates in most elections.

There are no large population centers in the 10th District portion of the Ohio River Valley. Marietta and Ironton are manufacturing towns, but neither has more than 20,000 residents. Founded in 1788, Marietta is the oldest settlement in Ohio. Ironton has integrated its economy with that of nearby Ashland, Kentucky.

The northern counties of the 10th have the best farm land and the largest towns. Nearly half the district voters live in Fairfield County (Lancaster), Licking County (Newark) and Muskingum County (Zanesville). With a 28 percent population boom in the last decade, Fairfield is the fastest-growing county in the 10th. Bedroom communities have blossomed along Route 33, a four-lane highway that connects Lancaster with Columbus, 30 miles to the northwest.

Both Lancaster and Newark, 30 miles to the northeast, are major glass-producing centers. Their counties are reliably Republican. Neighboring Muskingum occasionally strays.

Population: 513,755. White 499,195 (97%), Black 10,929 (2%). Spanish origin 2,503 (1%). 18 and over 362,212 (71%), 65 and over 57,381 (11%). Median age: 30.

if their participation fell below a certain percentage.

At Home: Miller's election in 1966 over Democratic incumbent Walter H. Moeller was due, in large part, to the long political coattails of James A. Rhodes, the district's native son. Winning re-election as governor in 1966, Rhodes carried the 10th by 34,000 votes — enough to pull Miller into office by 4,401.

Since then, Miller has kept in touch with the voters mostly through newsletters and ceremonial visits to county fairs and other gatherings. Like virtually all Appalachian districts, the 10th is sparsely populated and difficult for challengers to campaign in; Miller's opponents have been frustrated for years by their inability even to make their names known districtwide. Only once in eight re-election campaigns has Miller lost even one county — and that was removed by redistricting the following year.

In several of his campaigns, Miller has had the easy task of facing professors from Ohio University at Athens. He has been challenged by an economist, a historian and a political scientist, and none has drawn a third of the vote against him. As a countrified ex-mayor

Ohio - 10th District

with a correspondence degree in engineering, Miller has simply fit the constituency better than they have. Since 1974, the opponents have been an accountant, an auto dealer, a hotel manager and a manufacturing engineer, and they have been no more of a threat.

Committees

Appropriations (6th of 21 Republicans)
Treasury - Postal Service - General Government (ranking);
Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary.

Elections

1982 General
Clarence Miller (R) 100,044 (63%)
John Buchanan (D) 57,983 (37%)

1980 General
Clarence Miller (R) 143,403 (74%)
Jack Stecher (D) 49,433 (26%)

Previous Winning Percentages: 1978 (74%) 1976 (69%)
1974 (70%) 1972 (73%) 1970 (67%) 1968 (69%)
1966 (52%)

District Vote For President

1980		1976	
D	87,486 (39%)	D	85,488 (47%)
R	123,853 (55%)	R	94,396 (51%)
I	9,542 (4%)		

Campaign Finance

	Receipts	Receipts from PACs	Expenditures
1982			
Miller (R)	\$64,100	\$24,180 (38%)	\$52,852
Buchanan (D)	\$11,324	\$5,012 (44%)	\$11,402
1980			
Miller (R)	\$41,204	\$24,188 (59%)	\$32,336
Stecher (D)	\$7,729	\$10 (0.1%)	\$7,647

Voting Studies

Year	Presidential Support		Party Unity		Conservative Coalition	
	S	O	S	O	S	O
1982	70	30	80	18	78	22
1981	72	28	86	14	91	9
1980	31	69	90	10	88	12

1979	22	78	91	9	94	6
1978	31	68	88	10	86	12
1977	35	65	89	11	88	12
1976	80	20	93	7	92	8
1975	63	36	86	12	87	11
1974 (Ford)	48	52				
1974	75	25	80	20	76	24
1973	54	46	75	25	72	28
1972	68	32	79	21	84	16
1971	70	30	77	23	80	20
1970	69	31	74	26	73	27
1969	51	49	84	16	96	4
1968	48	52	87	13	90	10
1967	43	57	91	9	94	6

S = Support

O = Opposition

Key Votes

Reagan budget proposal (1981)	Y
Legal services reauthorization (1981)	N
Disapprove sale of AWACs planes to Saudi Arabia (1981)	N
Index income taxes (1981)	Y
Subsidize home mortgage rates (1982)	N
Amend Constitution to require balanced budget (1982)	Y
Delete MX funding (1982)	N
Retain existing cap on congressional salaries (1982)	Y
Adopt nuclear freeze (1983)	N

Interest Group Ratings

Year	ADA	ACA	AFL-CIO	CCUS
1982				
1981	5	74	25	64
1980	5	92	20	84
1979	11	75	16	79
1978	0	92	20	100
1977	20	92	15	67
1976	15	93	13	100
1975	5	93	13	100
1974	5	85	9	76
1973	35	80	0	90
1972	28	85	9	91
1971	6	87	0	100
1970	22	79	8	-
1969	40	68	14	90
1968	7	71	20	-
1967	0	91	0	-
	7	93	0	100